

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

JERRY DONALD SAXTON, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Officer MANN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-CV-239 (MTT)

**ORDER**

On June 4, 2025, plaintiff Jerry Donald Saxton, Jr., proceeding pro se, filed his complaint. Doc. 1. That same day, he filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). Doc. 2. For the reasons stated, Saxton’s motion to proceed IFP (Doc. 2) is **GRANTED**. However, Saxton’s complaint lacks important factual allegations that Saxton may have omitted because of his pro se status. Thus, the Court **ORDERS** Saxton to amend his complaint by **July 22, 2025**.

**I. DISCUSSION**

**A. Motion to Proceed IFP**

Motions to proceed IFP are governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), which provides:

[A]ny court of the United States may authorize the commencement, prosecution or defense of any suit, action or proceeding, civil or criminal, or appeal therein, without prepayment of fees or security therefor, by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such prisoner possesses<sup>1</sup> that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Despite the statute’s use of the phrase ‘prisoner possesses,’ the affidavit requirement applies to all persons requesting leave to proceed IFP.” *Martinez v. Kristi Kleaners, Inc.*, 364 F.3d 1305, 1306 n.1 (11th Cir. 2004).

When considering a motion to proceed IFP filed under § 1915(a), “the only determination to be made by the court is whether the statements in the affidavit satisfy the requirement of poverty.” *Martinez v. Kristi Kleaners, Inc.*, 364 F.3d 1305, 1307 (11th Cir. 2004) (cleaned up). A plaintiff is not required to show he is “absolutely destitute.” *Id.* (quoting *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948)). Rather, “an affidavit will be held sufficient if it represents that the litigant, because of his poverty, is unable to pay for the court fees and costs, and to support and provide necessities for himself and his dependents.” *Id.* “A court may not deny an IFP motion without first comparing the applicant’s assets and liabilities in order to determine whether he has satisfied the poverty requirement.” *Thomas v. Chattahoochee Jud. Cir.*, 574 F. App’x 916, 917 (11th Cir. 2014) (citing *Martinez*, 364 F.3d at 1307-08).

However, § 1915(a) “should not be a broad highway into the federal courts.” *Phillips v. Mashburn*, 746 F.2d 782, 785 (11th Cir. 1984). Section 1915(a) “conveys only a privilege to proceed without payment to only those litigants unable to pay costs without undue hardship.” *Mack v. Petty*, 2014 WL 3845777, at \*1 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 4, 2014) (citations omitted). District courts have “wide discretion” in deciding whether a plaintiff can proceed IFP, and “should grant the privilege sparingly,” especially in civil cases for damages. *Martinez*, 364 F.3d at 1306 (citation omitted).

Saxton’s IFP affidavit establishes that he cannot pay the court fees. Doc. 2. Thus, the Court finds that Saxton is unable to pay the costs of this proceeding without undue hardship and therefore his motion for leave to proceed IFP (Doc. 2) is **GRANTED**.

## B. Frivolity Review

Section 1915 does not create an absolute right to proceed IFP in civil actions. “Where the IFP affidavit is sufficient on its face to demonstrate economic eligibility, the court should first docket the case and then proceed to the question of whether the asserted claim is frivolous.” *Martinez*, 364 F.3d at 1307 (internal quotation marks, alterations, and citation omitted). When allowing a plaintiff to proceed IFP, the Court shall dismiss the case if the Court determines that the complaint (1) “is frivolous or malicious;” (2) “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted;” or (3) “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

A claim is frivolous if it “has little or no chance of success,” meaning that it appears “from the face of the complaint that the factual allegations are ‘clearly baseless’ or that the legal theories are ‘indisputably meritless.’” *Carroll v. Gross*, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). “A dismissal under § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for failure to state a claim is governed by the same standard as a dismissal pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).”<sup>2</sup> *Thomas v. Harris*, 399 F. App’x 508, 509 (11th Cir. 2010) (citing *Mitchell v. Farcass*, 112 F.3d 1483, 1490 (11th Cir. 1997)). However, because Saxton is proceeding pro se, his “pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by attorneys and will, therefore, be liberally construed.” *Hughes v. Lott*, 350 F.3d 1157, 1160 (11th Cir. 2003) (quotation marks and citation omitted). But “[d]espite

---

<sup>2</sup> To avoid dismissal pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), a complaint must contain specific factual matter to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). On a motion to dismiss, “all well-pleaded facts are accepted as true, and the reasonable inferences therefrom are construed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.” *In re Galectin Therapeutics, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 843 F.3d 1257, 1269 n.4 (11th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Garfield v. NDC Health Corp.*, 466 F.3d 1255, 1261 (11th Cir. 2006)).

the leniency afforded pro se plaintiffs, the district court does not have license to rewrite a deficient pleading.” *Osahar v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 297 F. App’x 863, 864 (11th Cir. 2008) (citation omitted).

Saxton alleges that Sheriff David Davis, Officer Mann, and four additional “unknown code enforcement” officers violated the First and Fourth Amendments by removing property from his “shop and home” without authority. Doc. 1. He alleges that the defendants “handcuffed” him and “got out his phone to record the act,” which he alleges “violated the free exercise of his speech and to the press.” *Id.* at 4. He alleges that although the defendants had court authority to enter some areas of his property, they went “undercover” and removed property from areas outside of the scope of that authorization. *Id.* at 5, 6. He also alleges that “these officers acted with deliberate indifference” because his “ex-wife was living with an [officer’s] best friend.” *Id.* at 6. Saxton seeks “punitive and compensatory damages for lost property” and “lost wages.” *Id.* at 6. Beyond that, Saxton’s complaint reveals little. For instance, it is unclear when the alleged violations occurred, what court order the defendants relied on, and what wages Saxton lost as a result of the alleged constitutional violations.

Thus far, Saxton’s allegations appear thin, and the Court is unable to conduct a thorough frivolity review. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(b) (stating that a court is required to dismiss a case brought by a pro se plaintiff if it (1) is frivolous, or malicious; (2) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (3) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief). It is not clear whether this deficiency is because of the manner in which the allegations have been pled, or whether they simply lack substance. However, given Saxton’s pro se status, the Court will afford him an

opportunity to amend his complaint to state viable claims. *See Duff v. Steub*, 378 F. App'x 868, 872 (11th Cir. 2010) (per curiam) ("When it appears a pro se plaintiff's complaint, if more carefully drafted, might state a claim, the district court should give the pro se plaintiff an opportunity to amend his complaint instead of dismissing it.").

For these reasons, Saxton is **ORDERED** to amend his complaint to include all facts that he wishes to make a part of these proceedings and cite the appropriate statutory or constitutional authority for bringing his claims. Saxton shall have until July 22, 2025 to file his amended complaint.

In the "statement of claims" section of his amended complaint, Saxton must link any claims he makes to a named defendant. If Saxton fails to link a named defendant to a claim, the claim will be dismissed; if Saxton makes no allegations in the body of his complaint against a named defendant, that defendant will be removed from the action.

Saxton must provide enough facts to plausibly demonstrate that each defendant's actions or omissions resulted in the violation of his rights under a specific law. It is also recommended that, when drafting his "statement of claims," Saxton list numbered responses to the following questions (to the extent possible) along with the name of each defendant:

- (1) What did each defendant do (or not do) to violate his rights?
- (2) When did each action occur?
- (3) How was Saxton injured as a result of each defendant's actions?

The amended complaint will take the place of and supersede Saxton's original complaint. *Schreane v. Middlebrooks*, 522 F. App'x 845, 847-48 (11th Cir. 2013). Saxton may not refer to, or incorporate by reference, his previous complaint. The Court

will not look back to the facts alleged in the original complaint once the amended complaint is filed; the Court will only consider the facts in the amended complaint when it conducts the frivolity review required by § 1915(e)(2)(B). *Hoefling v. City of Miami*, 811 F.3d 1271, 1277 (11th Cir. 2016) (holding that the filing of an amended pleading renders the previous pleading a “legal nullity”).

## II. CONCLUSION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and for the reasons set forth above, Saxton’s motion to proceed IFP (Doc. 2) is **GRANTED**, and Saxton is **ORDERED** to amend his complaint no later than **July 22, 2025**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 1st day of July, 2025.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT